

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

**FCC 15M-19  
10325**

In the Matter of	)	MB Docket No. 12-122
	)	
<b>Game Show Network, LLC,</b>	)	File No. CSR-8529-P
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
<b>Cablevision Systems Corp.,</b>	)	
Defendant	)	
	)	
Program Carriage Complaint	)	

**ORDER**

**Issued: May 20, 2015**

**Released: May 20, 2015**

On May 14, 2015, the Presiding Judge, upon request, modified the briefing schedule to allow the Enforcement Bureau (“Bureau”) seven additional days within which to file comments regarding the motion for summary decision of Cablevision System Corp. (“Cablevision”) and the opposition of Game Show Network, LLC (“GSN”).<sup>1</sup> The Bureau had previously argued that the additional time would “lead to greater efficiency” and decrease the “likelihood of repetitive arguments [being submitted] in the record” while the Bureau executed its duty of “fully represent[ing] the public interest.”<sup>2</sup>

Yesterday, the Bureau filed a Submission Regarding Cablevision’s Motion for Summary Decision in which the Bureau advised:

The Bureau has now carefully reviewed Cablevision’s Motion and GSN’s Opposition. The Bureau believes Cablevision’s and GSN’s respective pleadings fully and fairly state the issues pending before the Presiding Judge. Accordingly, the Bureau sees no reason to submit additional comments.

No participant or onlooker to this proceeding has been enlightened by the Bureau’s self-evident observation. Pleadings filed by qualified attorneys in Commission proceedings will assumedly “fully and fairly” state the issues that are pending before the Presiding Judge. By making such a pointless submission after five days of careful review, the Bureau disrespects the

---

<sup>1</sup> Order, FCC 15M-18 (rel. May 14, 2015).

<sup>2</sup> Enforcement Bureau’s Unopposed Request Regarding Cablevision’s Motion for Summary Decision at 1 (filed May 11, 2015).

Presiding Judge, insults his willingness to grant extensions for the benefit of receiving its carefully considered comment, and worst of all, abandons its responsibility to represent the public interest.

Accordingly, in the interest of serving the record and pursuant to Section 1.243 of the Commission's Rules,<sup>3</sup> the Enforcement Bureau, as a party to this proceeding, is ordered to make comment, at a minimum, (1) on whether summary decision is either appropriate or inappropriate at this time;<sup>4</sup> and (2) on whether the Bureau can ascertain the existence of any genuine issue of material fact requiring a hearing.<sup>5</sup> The Bureau's comments must be filed in a reasoned pleading by **12 noon on May 27, 2015**.

**SO ORDERED.**

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION<sup>6</sup>

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Richard L. Sippel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Richard" and last name "Sippel" clearly legible.

Richard L. Sippel  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 1.243(g). The Presiding Judge's authority to require the parties to prepare pleadings on matters of law under this Section trumps any authority that the Bureau believes it may have to determine the extent of its participation in this proceeding.

<sup>4</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 1.251(b).

<sup>5</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 1.251(a)(1).

<sup>6</sup> Courtesy copies sent to counsel *via* e-mail on date of issuance.